

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **October 22, 2004** the Examiner reviewed Claims 1-36. Claims 13-24 were allowed. Claims 1-12 and 25-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed at non-statutory subject matter.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101


Claims 1-12 and 25-36 were rejected because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 25 to clarify that the present invention stores the interval representation in the computer system memory, and after performing the interval Newton technique on the interval representation, also **records the guaranteed bounds** of the interval. Thus, the presentation performs a physical transformation by altering the state of the system memory. Applicant has also amended dependent claim 36 to correct antecedent basis. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 25 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-12, which depend upon claim 1, claims 14-24, which depend upon claim 13, and claims 26-36, which depend upon claim 35, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: October 28, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665